

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING BOARD**

*Amended*

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wisconsin Statutes, a regular meeting of the Brown County Criminal Justice Coordinating Board was held on November 8, 2018 at 7:30 am in the Karen H. Dorau Memorial Conference Room at the Brown County District Attorney's Office, 300 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

---

<b>Members Present:</b>	Judge William Atkinson Human Services Committee Rep. Joan Brusky County Executive Troy Streckenbach Citizen Rep. Christopher Zahn	Probation and Parole Rep. Jennifer Hornacek District Attorney David Lasee Citizen Rep. Tim Mc Nulty
<b>Members Excused:</b>	Sheriff John Gossage	Citizen Rep. Bob Srenaski
<b>Others Present:</b>	Treatment Court Sup. Mark Vanden Hoogen Family Services Rep. Angela Steuck District Court Administrator Tom Schappa	Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery Clerk of Courts John Vander Leest Jail Lieutenant John Mitchell

---

**1. Call Meeting to Order.**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Judge Atkinson at 7:34 am.

**2. Approve/modify Agenda.**

**Motion made by David Lasee, seconded by Tim Mc Nulty to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**3. Approve/modify Minutes of September 13, 2018.**

Supervisor Brusky questioned why Jail Lieutenant John Mitchell was listed under "members presents" on the minutes from the November 8 meeting and further, why Jail Captain Heidi Michel was also listed. Mitchell explained that he was there representing the former Jail Captain while he was out. The newly appointed Jail Captain, Heidi Michel, was at the last meeting so he could introduce her as the new Jail Captain.

**Motion made by Joan Brusky, seconded by David Lasee to amend the November 8, 2018 minutes by moving Jail Lieutenant John Mitchell to the "others present" section of the minutes. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Motion made by Tim Mc Nulty, seconded by Joan Brusky to approve as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**4. Jail population numbers (Sheriff).**

Jail Lieutenant John Mitchell informed the Jail is currently at 92% capacity with 35 males shipped out to Oconto County and 5 females shipped out to Green Lake County. In addition there are 20 male federal inmates and 2 female federal inmates in the Jail.

**5. Criminal Justice System Efficiency Improvement Work Group (Supervisor Brusky, Bob Srenaski).**

Judge Atkinson noted he has not assigned any members to the work group yet. Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery said he has reviewed minutes from the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board (CJCB) from March, May and August 2018 and found that the creation of the Criminal Justice System Efficiency Improvement Work Group was approved in March, but the number of members, who they are, how they are appointed or what their term is was never determined. The July minutes from this body reflect that the work group that was approved was being held in

abeyance and then on August 29 an agenda was received indicating the Criminal Justice System Efficiency Improvement Work Group had scheduled a meeting. Hemery attended that meeting and pointed out that although the work group was created in March, it was to be held in abeyance and then this was sent back to the CJCB to address some issues.

On a broader level, Hemery pointed out that there have been issues in the past with subcommittees and ad hoc committees in that parts are left out when it comes to outlining the membership and things of that nature. Hemery indicated the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors will be asking him to draft a policy that any time a subcommittee or ad hoc committee is created, it is done by resolution. This will ensure that all subcommittees and ad hoc committees are in order and the membership and purpose of the subcommittees or ad hoc committees are spelled out. Hemery continued that the other reason a resolution will be required is to outline the fiscal impact as the taking of minutes of all of these groups stresses County Board staff who already take the minutes of the six standing committees of the County Board along with a number of other boards and subcommittees. Hemery noted the fiscal impact of a recently created subcommittee was estimated to be \$3,000 - \$4,000 per year. He said some committees take their own minutes and that is something Bob Srenaski said he would be willing to do for the Criminal Justice System Efficiency Improvement Work Group.

Hemery continued that this group can have a discussion at this meeting to fill in some of the blanks with regard to membership and purpose of the group. Brusky asked if a work group is considered to be the same as a subcommittee and needs to follow the same protocol of a subcommittee. She referred to a handout she provided; a copy of which is attached, which outlines Dunn County's Criminal Justice Collaborating Council and the work groups that fall under that council. She asked if the CJCB were to have multiple work groups, if they would have to all go through a formal process to get a budget for each one, even if there is not a budget necessary. Hemery explained that when a standing committee creates a smaller group, it is either a subcommittee or an ad hoc committee. The main difference between the two is that a subcommittee runs for a long time with a broad purpose while an ad hoc committee has a very specific purpose and once the purpose is reached, the ad hoc committee is automatically dissolved. Hemery said most committees do not have a budget, but Brusky pointed out that one of the issues cited with the Criminal Justice System Efficiency Improvement Work Group was costs that would be associated with it. Hemery noted they have recently begun to look at costs to the County for things like preparation and distribution of agendas and the time spent by County Board staff sitting in the meetings and then preparing and distributing minutes. Brusky also asked if "work group" would be an inaccurate term. Hemery said there are a lot of variations in the names of groups, but they would all be either a subcommittee or an ad hoc committee.

Clerk of Courts John Vander Leest commented that typically subcommittee members are appointed by the County Executive. Hemery noted that the four citizen representatives on the CJCB are appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Board. He does not feel it would be unusual for a standing committee to create a subcommittee and also designate the membership, length of term, etc. He has seen that when citizen members are involved, there is often involvement from the County Executive and County Board. Vander Leest said if there was a subcommittee that needed a budget, there would likely need to be a motion and support from the County Board saying what the budget is and what it will be used for. Brusky reiterated that the budget of the work group was one of the issues of concern as pointed out in the last minutes.

The membership of the work group was discussed. Judge Atkinson informed his position with regard to the purpose of the group is to be consistent with the original resolution that created this and it would then come under the form of a technical work group consisting of public County agency staff and other relevant public and private sector people to develop and refine policy/program incentives. Hemery clarified that there really was not a resolution creating this, but said he had received correspondence from Bob Srenaski indicating Srenaski felt the group should consist of 5 – 8 individuals and that the charter should be limited to one year, but renewable by vote of the CJCB. Srenaski also felt that the members should be approved by the Chair of the CJCB. With regard to budget, Srenaski indicated the work group has no budget and has not requested one, but if funding is needed, a detailed request for approval would be submitted through the required County process. Hemery added that the Board Chair has put in a communication to have Hemery create a sort of fill in the blank resolution that can be used to create subcommittees and ad hoc committees and he could bring back a full County Board approved resolution or at least a draft of what he would want the Board to approve which would make it easier to create this subcommittee. Judge Atkinson said it would probably be easier to have something in front of us when we are discussing this. Hemery said if the CJCB could give him some guidance as to how members are to be nominated, appointed and confirmed, he can draft something to bring back to the next CJCB meeting for review and discussion.

Judge Atkinson asked if Srenaski and his group could move forward under the Criminal Justice Division that will be starting January 1. County Executive Troy Streckenbach said the Criminal Justice Division is budget neutral and there are meetings happening regarding the transition to that new model. Angela Steuck of Family Services added that they met recently with Human Services on this to talk about the transition period. It was decided that Family Services will continue to take intakes into the current day report center through December 31 and then re-evaluate how to move forward after the first of the year. There were discussions of a partnership until July 1 of next year at which time the day report center will be fully transitioned away from Family Services and into the new Criminal Justice Division concept. In the meantime, Family Services is committed to working together on staffing the day report center but Steuck noted that Family Services has already had one staff departure because of the transition. There have also been discussions of Human Services adding internal County staff to the day report center programming if necessary to ensure coverage.

Streckenbach questioned if the Criminal Justice Division would be the appropriate division to manage the work group. District Attorney David Lasee said once the Criminal Justice Division is up and fully ready to go, it would be the appropriate division to manage the work group with the understanding that the head of that division would be active in criminal justice system management, including efficiencies in the system. They would obviously have to have someone to supervise staff, and part of that would be to have someone in a role to help identify issues in the system and ways to improve them. That person could also potentially oversee the data collection so someone from the work group could go to the division head and tell them what data they want to analyze and the division head can then coordinate with the other appropriate County entities to get the data without having to have a formal subcommittee.

Streckenbach said in a perfect world, what Lasee described would work, but realistically, everyone already has a lot of work to do. He feels the data mining the work group is looking for is a little more involved and would require a lot of commitment and time. If the work group is coming to the division head requesting all this data mining, it would blow up into something that people stop working on. Lt. Mitchell added that there have been instances where the Jail has spent time creating reports that will not be used in running the Jail and they are eating up free reports that the County does not need. Later on when the County actually needs a report, the number of free reports available could be used up and will end up costing the County money.

Brusky referenced the handouts she provided and pointed out that the purpose of Dunn County's data work group is to provide guidance in the collection and integration of local criminal justice data consistent with the priorities of the CICC Executive Committee in order to inform policy makers' decisions within Dunn County. This is somewhat comparable to what she and Srenaski are thinking of doing. Brusky continued that she had requested information from the Criminal Justice Coordinator of the Dunn County Criminal Justice Collaboration Division regarding the membership of their work group. Brusky was advised that the Dunn County Work Group meets every other month or as needed and the members includes the DHS Director, Clerk of Courts, District Attorney, DA's Deferred Prosecution Coordinator, DOC Probation Agent, Sheriff, Sheriff's Office Record Technician, Jail Huber Sargent, Police Crime Prevention Specialist, Police Records Technician, 911/Emergency Operations and the Executive Director of a domestic abuse shelter.

Judge Atkinson said he also has talked with Srenaski and knows what his intentions are. Judge Atkinson said he can draft a rough draft of a resolution to get the ball rolling. Hemery suggested Judge Atkinson provide information to him and he can put the information into resolution form. Judge Atkinson asked that if anyone has anything they would like to see in the resolution to get the information to him as soon as possible.

Vander Leest noted there seems to be a lot going on in Dunn County, but feels Brown County should just pick one area to focus on to help improve the justice system and its efficiencies and work towards that goal and then provide some recommendations. Brusky said she finds it very interesting that Dunn County is one-sixth the size of Brown County and has multiple work groups, while Brown County doesn't even have one work group. Streckenbach said the size and structure in Dunn County cannot be compared to Brown County due to the size of the County. Judge Atkinson said that if anyone feels something should be added to the next agenda to discuss other work groups, to let him know.

6. **Supervisor Brusky's request to amend membership of the CJCB (Supervisor Brusky).**

Judge Atkinson said there was a request to add a treatment court judge to the CJCB. He wrote a letter to the Public Safety Committee regarding this and asked that they refer this back because the judicial branch is a co-equal branch of government and it is the judges' position that the legislative branch should not be putting judges on boards or commissions without the judges requesting it. The judges believe the request should come from them rather than being added by the legislative branch. Judge Atkinson continued that the judges would like to speak with one voice and the goal is that the voice of one judge would be the voice of what the judges have collectively discussed. The judges meet monthly and they have open, free and frank discussions amongst themselves and they decide in that forum what the public position should be. It is the preference of the judges to have only one judge on the CJCB but noted that all judges should have an open invitation to come to these meetings to speak if they desire.

Further Judge Atkinson said when there is a lot of contact between the judges and the legislative branch, it results in a number of substitutions of judge cases. Judge Atkinson asked the CJCB to not approve the request to add an additional judicial member to this Board so that the judges can continue to speak with one voice.

Hemery noted he has looked into the committee structure of the CJCB and there are other areas that should be looked at so all changes can be made at one time. He provided a breakdown of the history of the membership of the CJCB, a copy of which is attached. The Resolution regarding the CJCB was last amended in August, 2018 and at that time the term *or designee* was added to several of the membership positions and Hemery suggested this Board examine whether that designation should be added to more of the positions.

Brusky asked if it would be appropriate to have a group formed to look at the membership of the CJCB and referenced the different membership that Dunn County has. Vander Leest feels having a subcommittee to look at the membership will slow things down and feels that the current group can discuss and determine the appropriate membership. He feels that adding *or designee* to many or most of the members would be appropriate and also feels that the Director of the Criminal Justice Division or designee should be added to the membership. In addition, Vander Leest suggested the Clerk of Courts or designee be added because many of the functions that go on with in the justice system involve the Clerk of Courts. Hemery suggested that individuals forward their suggestions on this to Judge Atkinson who could then review them and forward on to Hemery so he can draft something to be reviewed. Brusky feels having a treatment court just as a voting member of the criminal justice coordinating board is a good idea and noted that the treatment courts serve about 100 citizens and are an integral part of the criminal justice system. In the past there was a treatment court judge on the CJCB, but at this time there is not one. Having a treatment court judge as a voting member would ensure there would always be a place for their input as a voting member. Judge Atkinson responded that every treatment court judge would be welcome to come to this committee and address any issues at any time. He does not feel picking one treatment court judge to be on the committee would benefit the committee. He also said that although he is not a treatment court judge, he is very familiar with the treatment courts and what goes on at them because they are discussed at the judges' meetings.

7. **Future Agenda Items, if any.**

The next meeting date was discussed. Judge Atkinson indicated a desire to hold meetings on a day other than Thursday as jury trials are often held on those days. The next meeting is scheduled for January 15, 2019 at 8:00 am.

8. **Other such matters as authorized by law. None.**

9. **Adjourn.**

**Motion made by David Lasee, seconded by Tim Mc Nulty to adjourn at 8:22 am. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio  
Administrative Specialist